

REMARKS

Applicant has the following response to the Office Action of August 9, 2006 in the above-identified application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has the following rejections under 35 USC §103(a):

- A. Claims 1-3, 9-12, 18-22 and 28-31 are rejected as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629) in view of Inoguchi et al. (US 6,262,531).
- B. Claims 5-7, 14-16, 24-26 and 33-35 are rejected as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. and Inoguchi et al. in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,388,652).
- C. Claims 8, 17, 27 and 36 are rejected as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. and Inoguchi et al. in view of Yamazaki et al. '652 and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,445,005).
- D. Claims 4, 13, 23 and 32 are rejected as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. and Inoguchi et al. in view of Yamazaki et al. '652 and further in view of Choi (US 6,583,577).

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claims 1, 9, 19, and 28 recite the feature of “an insulating layer for sealing the EL element.” As the Examiner admits, Yamada does not disclose this feature. The Examiner, however, cites Inoguchi and contends that Inoguchi “discloses a thin film EL display panel having the whole EL element is seal [sic] by silicon oil (or insulating layer, see col. 1, lines 46-49, col. 2, lines 36-39).”

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Inoguchi discloses an insulating layer for sealing the EL element. The Examiner cites silicon oil in Inoguchi as showing this feature, but silicon oil is not an insulating layer (nor is there any disclosure at either of the Examiner’s cites of an insulating layer).¹ Hence, neither Inoguchi nor Yamada (nor any of the other cited references) disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

¹ It is noted that even Inoguchi distinguishes between an insulating layer and silicon oil. See e.g. cols. 5-6 Inoguchi.

However, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 to recite “an insulating film over the EL element.” This amendment clearly distinguishes the claimed insulating film from the silicon oil in Inoguchi. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at page 20, line 19 - page 21, line 2 of the specification of the present application.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that all of these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any fee due for this amendment.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 9, 2006

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No.: 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 000026568